

Derivations for the even part of the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra in positive characteristic*

Wende Liu^{1,2,†}, Xiuying Hua², and Yucai Su¹

¹Department of Mathematics
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026

²Department of Mathematics
Harbin Normal University, Harbin 150080

Abstract

In this paper we mainly study the derivations for even part of the finite-dimensional odd Hamiltonian superalgebra HO over a field of prime characteristic. We first give the generator set of $HO_{\overline{0}}$. Then we determine the homogeneous derivations from $HO_{\overline{0}}$ into $W_{\overline{0}}$, the even part of the generalized Witt superalgebra W . Finally, we determine the derivation algebra and outer derivation algebra of $HO_{\overline{0}}$.

Keywords: General Witt superalgebra; special superalgebra; derivation space

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 17B50, 17B40

0. Introduction

The theory of Lie superalgebras has seen a significant development (c.f. [11]). For example, V. G. Kac has completed the classification of finite-dimensional simple Lie superalgebras and the classification of infinite-dimensional simple linearly compact Lie superalgebras over algebraically closed fields of characteristics zero (see [2, 3]). But there are not so plentiful results on modular Lie superalgebras (that is, Lie superalgebras over fields of finite characteristic). For example, the classification problem is still open for finite-dimensional simple Lie superalgebras. As far as we know, the references [4, 10] should be the earliest papers on modular Lie superalgebras.

In this paper we shall discuss the derivations for the even part of the finite-dimensional odd Hamiltonian superalgebra HO over a field of prime characteristic. Our work is essentially motivated by the work on modular Lie algebras of Cartan type (see [1, 12, 13]). In [9, 14, 16] the superderivation algebras were determined for the finite-dimensional modular Lie superalgebras of Cartan type W , S , H , and K . In [8] the superderivation algebra

*Supported by a NSF grant 10471096 of China and “One Hundred Talents Program” from University of Science and Technology of China

[†]Corresponding author. Email-addresses: wendeliu@ustc.edu.cn (W. Liu), huaxiuyingnihao@163.com (X. Hua), ycsu@ustc.edu.cn (Y. Su)

was determined for the finite-dimensional odd Hamiltonian superalgebra HO . Note that the derivations of the even parts have been studied for the Lie superalgebras of Cartan type W , S , and H (see [5, 6]). However, in contrast to the setting of H , we determine completely the derivation space from the even part of HO into the even part of W , and the derivation algebra of the even part of HO , also.

This paper is arranged as follows. In Section 1 we introduce the necessary notations, definitions and known results. In Section 2 we first give the generating set of the even part of the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra. Then we determine the nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from the even part of the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra into the even part of the generalized Witt superalgebra. In Section 3 we determine the negative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from the even part of the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra into the even part of the generalized Witt superalgebra. In Section 4 we determine completely the derivation algebra and outer derivation algebra of the even part of the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra.

1. Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{\bar{0}, \bar{1}\}$ be the field of two elements. For a vector superspace $V = V_{\bar{0}} \oplus V_{\bar{1}}$, we denote by $p(a) = \theta$ the *parity of a homogeneous element* $a \in V_{\theta}, \theta \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. We assume throughout that the notation $p(x)$ implies that x is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -homogeneous element.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie algebra and V a $\mathfrak{g}$ -module. A linear mapping $D : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow V$ is called a *derivation* from $\mathfrak{g}$ into V if $D(xy) = x \cdot D(y) - y \cdot D(x)$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$. A derivation $D : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow V$ is called *inner* if there is $v \in V$ such that $D(x) = x \cdot v$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. Following [13, p. 13], denote by $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ the *derivation space* from $\mathfrak{g}$ into V . Then $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodule of $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathfrak{g}, V)$. Assume in addition that $\mathfrak{g}$ and V are finite-dimensional and that $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_r$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded and $V = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} V_r$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathfrak{g}$ -module. Then $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}, V) = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Der}_r(\mathfrak{g}, V)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $\mathfrak{g}$ -module by setting

$$\text{Der}_r(\mathfrak{g}, V) := \{D \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}, V) \mid D(\mathfrak{g}_i) \subset V_{r+i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

In the case of $V = \mathfrak{g}$, the *derivation algebra* $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$ coincides with $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$ and $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigoplus_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Der}_r(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded Lie algebra. If $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{-r \leq i \leq s} \mathfrak{g}_i$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded Lie algebra, then $\bigoplus_{-r \leq i \leq 0} \mathfrak{g}_i$ is called the *top of* $\mathfrak{g}$ (with respect to the gradation).

In the sequel we assume throughout that the underlying field $\mathbb{F}$ is of characteristic $p > 3$. Let us review the notions of modular Lie superalgebras of Cartan-type W and S and their gradation structures. In addition to the standard notation $\mathbb{Z}$, we write $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of positive integers, and $\mathbb{N}_0$ for the set of nonnegative integers. Henceforth, we will let n denote fixed integers in $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, 2\}$ without notice. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, we put $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$. Let $\mathcal{O}(n)$ denote the *divided power algebra over* $\mathbb{F}$ with an $\mathbb{F}$ -basis $\{x^{(\alpha)} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n\}$. For $\varepsilon_i = (\delta_{i1}, \dots, \delta_{in})$, we abbreviate $x^{(\varepsilon_i)}$ to $x_i, i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\Lambda(n)$ be the *exterior superalgebra over* $\mathbb{F}$ in n variables $x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n}$. Denote the tensor product by $\mathcal{O}(n, n) = \mathcal{O}(n) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \Lambda(n)$. Obviously, $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$ is an associative superalgebra with a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -gradation induced by the trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -gradation of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ and the natural $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -gradation of $\Lambda(n)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$ is super-commutative. For $g \in \mathcal{O}(n), f \in \Lambda(n)$, we write gf for $g \otimes f$. The following formulas hold in $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$:

$$x^{(\alpha)} x^{(\beta)} = \binom{\alpha + \beta}{\alpha} x^{(\alpha + \beta)} \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n;$$

$$x_k x_l = -x_l x_k \quad \text{for } k, l = n + 1, \dots, 2n;$$

$$x^{(\alpha)}x_k = x_kx^{(\alpha)} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, k = n+1, \dots, 2n,$$

where $\binom{\alpha+\beta}{\alpha} := \prod_{i=1}^n \binom{\alpha_i+\beta_i}{\alpha_i}$. Put $Y_0 := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $Y_1 := \{n+1, \dots, 2n\}$ and $Y := Y_0 \cup Y_1$. Let

$$\mathbb{B}_k := \{\langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle \mid n+1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq 2n\}$$

be the set of k -tuples of strictly increasing integers between $n+1$ and $2n$, and put $\mathbb{B} := \mathbb{B}(n) := \bigcup_{k=0}^n \mathbb{B}_k$, where $\mathbb{B}_0 := \emptyset$. Put $\mathbb{B}^0 := \{u \in \mathbb{B} \mid |u| \text{ even}\}$ and $\mathbb{B}^1 := \{u \in \mathbb{B} \mid |u| \text{ odd}\}$,

where for $u = \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle \in \mathbb{B}_k$, $|u| := k$, $|\emptyset| := 0$, $x^\emptyset := 1$. For $u = \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \rangle \in \mathbb{B}_k$, we set $x^u := x_{i_1}x_{i_2}\dots x_{i_k}$; we also use u to stand for the set $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ if no confusion occurs. Clearly, $\{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, u \in \mathbb{B}\}$ constitutes an $\mathbb{F}$ -basis of $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$. Let $\partial_1, \partial_2, \dots, \partial_{2n}$ be the linear transformations of $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$ such that

$$\partial_r(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) = \begin{cases} x^{(\alpha-\varepsilon_r)}x^u, & r \in Y_0 \\ x^{(\alpha)} \cdot \partial x^u / \partial x_r, & r \in Y_1. \end{cases}$$

Then $\partial_1, \partial_2, \dots, \partial_{2n}$ are superderivations of the superalgebra $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$. Let

$$W(n, n) = \left\{ \sum_{r \in Y} f_r \partial_r \mid f_r \in \mathcal{O}(n, n), r \in Y \right\}.$$

Then $W(n, n)$ is a Lie superalgebra, which is contained in $\text{Der}(\mathcal{O}(n, n))$. Obviously, $\text{p}(\partial_i) = \mu(i)$, where

$$\mu(i) := \begin{cases} \bar{0}, & i \in Y_0 \\ \bar{1}, & i \in Y_1. \end{cases}$$

One may verify that

$$[fD, gE] = fD(g)E - (-1)^{\text{p}(fD)\text{p}(gE)}gE(f)D + (-1)^{\text{p}(D)\text{p}(g)}fg[D, E]$$

for $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(n, n)$, $D, E \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{O}(n, n))$. Let

$$\underline{t} := (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n, \quad \pi := (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n)$$

where $\pi_i := p^{t_i} - 1, i \in Y_0$. Let $\mathbb{A} := \mathbb{A}(n; \underline{t}) = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \mid \alpha_i \leq \pi_i, i \in Y_0\}$. Then

$$\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}) := \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}} \left\{ x^{(\alpha)}x^u \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{A}, u \in \mathbb{B} \right\}$$

is a finite-dimensional subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}(n, n)$ with a natural $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradation $\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}) = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\xi} \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})_r$ by putting

$$\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})_r := \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}} \{x^{(\alpha)}x^u \mid |\alpha| + |u| = r\}, \quad \xi := |\pi| + n.$$

Set

$$W(n, n; \underline{t}) := \left\{ \sum_{r \in Y} f_r \partial_r \mid f_r \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}), r \in Y \right\}.$$

Then $W(n, n; \underline{t})$ is a finite-dimensional simple Lie superalgebra (see [15]). Obviously, $W(n, n; \underline{t})$ is a free $\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$ -module with $\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$ -basis $\{\partial_r \mid r \in Y\}$. We note that $W(n, n; \underline{t})$ possesses a *standard* $\mathbb{F}$ -basis $\{x^{(\alpha)}x^u\partial_r \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{A}, u \in \mathbb{B}, r \in Y\}$. The $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradation

of $\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$ induces naturally a $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradation structure of $W(n, n; \underline{t}) = \bigoplus_{i=-1}^{\xi-1} W(n, n; \underline{t})_i$, where

$$W(n, n; \underline{t})_i := \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{f\partial_s \mid s \in Y, f \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})_{i+1}\}.$$

Put

$$i' = \begin{cases} i + m, & i \in Y_0 \\ i - m, & i \in Y_1. \end{cases}$$

Define $T_H : \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}) \rightarrow W(n, n; \underline{t})$ such that

$$T_H(a) := \sum_{i=1}^{2n} (-1)^{\mu(i)p(a)} \partial_i(a) \partial_{i'} \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}).$$

Then T_H is an odd linear mapping. For $a, b \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})$, one may easily verify that

$$[T_H(a), T_H(b)] = T_H(T_H(a)(b)) \quad (1.1)$$

(see [8, Proposition 1, Lemma 2]). Put

$$HO(n, n; \underline{t}) := \{T_H(a) \mid a \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})\}.$$

Then (1.1) shows that $HO(n, n; \underline{t})$ is a finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra. Following [3], we call this Lie superalgebra the odd Hamiltonian superalgebra (see also [8]). Put

$$\overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t}) := \overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t})_{\overline{0}} + \overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t})_{\overline{1}},$$

where

$$\overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t})_{\alpha} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i \partial_i \in W(n, n; \underline{t})_{\alpha} \mid \partial_i(a_{j'}) = (-1)^{(i,j,\alpha)} \partial_j(a_{i'}), i, j \in Y \right\}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $(i, j, \alpha) := \mu(i)\mu(j) + (\mu(i) + \mu(j))(\alpha + \overline{1})$. Note that $HO(n, n; \underline{t})$ and $\overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t})$ are all $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebras of $W(n, n; \underline{t})$.

In the sequel the even parts of $W(n, n; \underline{t})$, $HO(n, n; \underline{t})$ and $\overline{HO}(n, n; \underline{t})$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{HO}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{HO}}$, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{G} := \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{x^u \partial_r \mid r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}, p(x^u \partial_r) = \overline{0}\}$. Then $C_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = \mathcal{G}$; in particular, $C_{\mathcal{HO}}(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) \subset \mathcal{G}$. Note that $\mathcal{G}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of $\mathcal{W}$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ satisfy $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$. Let $E \in \mathcal{HO}$. Then $[E, \mathcal{W}_{-1}] \subseteq \ker \phi$ if and only if $\phi(E) \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{HO}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{HO}_{-1} = \mathcal{W}_{-1}$. This is a direct consequence of [6, Lemma 2.1.1]. $\square$

Lemma 1.2. ([6, Lemma 2.1.3]) *Let V be a vector space over $\mathbb{F}$ and $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \in V$. Let $A_i \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{F}} V$. Suppose there are $B_i \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{F}} V$ such that*

- (i) $A_i B_i A_i = A_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (ii) $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$ commute mutually;
- (iii) $A_i(v_j) = A_j(v_i)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq k$;

(iv) $A_i B_i(v_i) = v_i$, $A_i B_j = B_j A_i$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $i \neq j$.

Then there is $v \in V$ such that $A_i(v) = v_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Lemma 1.3. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ where $t \geq 0$. Then there is $E \in \mathcal{W}_t$ such that $(\phi - \text{ad}E)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$.

Proof. Apply [6, Proposition 2.1.6]. $\square$

2. Nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$

In order to compute the derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$, we first give the generating set of $\mathcal{HO}$, which will be frequently used in the sequel. Let

$$N := \{T_H(x_k x_l x_q) \mid k, l, q \in Y_1\},$$

$$M := \{T_H(x^{(q_i \varepsilon_i)} x_k) \mid i \in Y_0, 0 \leq q_i \leq \pi_i, k \in Y_1\}.$$

Proposition 2.1. $\mathcal{HO}$ is generated by $M \cup N$.

Proof. Let L be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{HO}$ generated by $M \cup N$. We proceed by induction on $|\alpha| + |u|$ to show that $T_H(x^{(\alpha)} x^u) \in L$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$ and $u \in \mathbb{B}^1$. When $|\alpha| + |u| = 1$, we have $\alpha = 0$ and therefore, $T_H(x_k) \in M \subset L$ for $k \in Y_1$. When $|\alpha| + |u| = 2$, $T_H(x_i x_k) \in M \subset L$ for $i \in Y_0$, $k \in Y_1$. When $|\alpha| + |u| = 3$, we have

$$[T_H(x_i x_{j'}), T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_j)} x_l)] = -(1 + \delta_{ij}) T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j)} x_l) \in L$$

for $i, j \in Y_0$ and $l \in Y_1$ with $l \neq i'$; also,

$$[T_H(x_j x_{i'}), T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})] = -T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j)} x_{i'}) \in L \quad \text{for } i, j \in Y_0.$$

Summarizing, $T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j)} x_k) \in L$ for all $k \in Y_1$, $i, j \in Y_0$. Since $T_H(x_k x_l x_q) \in N \subset L$ for $k, l, q \in Y_1$, our assertion holds for $|\alpha| + |u| = 3$. Now Suppose $|\alpha| + |u| > 3$. Direct computation shows that

$$[T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1)} x_{2'}), T_H(x^{(\pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_k)] = -T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1 + (\pi_2 - 1) \varepsilon_2)} x_k) \in L \quad \text{for all } k \in Y_1 \setminus 1';$$

$$[T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1 + (\pi_2 - 1) \varepsilon_2)} x_k), T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{k'} + \varepsilon_2)} x_k)] = (1 + \delta_{k, 2'}) T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1 + \pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_k) \in L \quad \text{for all } k \in Y_1 \setminus 1';$$

$$[T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_1)} x_{1'}), T_H(x^{(\pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_{1'})] = T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_1 + \pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_{1'}) \in L;$$

$$[T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1)} x_{1'}), T_H(x^{(\varepsilon_1 + \pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_{1'})] = -2T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1 + \pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_{1'}) \in L.$$

Since $\text{char} \mathbb{F} > 3$, $T_H(x^{(\pi_1 \varepsilon_1 + \pi_2 \varepsilon_2)} x_k) \in L$ for $k \in Y_1$. Similarly, one may show inductively that $T_H(x^{(\pi)} x_k) \in L$ for all $k \in Y_1$. Clearly,

$$[T_H(x^{(\pi)} x_k), T_H(x_{i'})] = T_H(x^{(\pi - \varepsilon_i)} x_k) \in L \quad \text{for all } i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1.$$

Therefore, $T_H(x^{(\alpha)} x_k) \in L$ for all $k \in Y_1$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$. Thus one may assume that $|u| \geq 3$. Let $x^u = x_{i_1'} x_{i_2'} \cdots x_{i_s'}$, where $i_{j'} \in Y_1$ and $s \geq 3$ is odd. If there is some $j' \in \{1', 2', \dots, s'\}$ such that $\alpha_{i_{j'}} < \pi_{i_{j'}}$, without loss of generality, assume that $j' \in \{1', 2', \dots, (s-2)'\}$. By inductive hypothesis,

$$[T_H(x^{(\alpha + \varepsilon_{i_j})} x_{i_1'} \cdots x_{i_{(s-2)'}'}), T_H(x_{i_{j'}} x_{i_{(s-1)'}'} x_{i_{s'}'})] = T_H(x^{(\alpha)} x^u) \in L;$$

if $\alpha_{i_r} = \pi_{i_r}$ for all $1 \leq r \leq s$ and there is some $j' \in \{(s+1)', \dots, n'\}$ such that $\alpha_{i_j} < \pi_{i_j}$, then by inductive hypothesis,

$$[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\alpha+\varepsilon_{i_j})}x_{i_1'} \cdots x_{i_{(s-2)'}}, \mathrm{T}_H(x_{i_j}))] = \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\alpha)}x_{i_1'} \cdots x_{i_{(s-2)'}}, x_{i_j}) \in L.$$

In the first case, we have shown that $\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{i_1})}x_{i_1'}, x_{i_{(s-1)'}}, x_{i_s'}) \in L$. Thus, in the second case we have

$$[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\alpha)}x_{i_1'} \cdots x_{i_{(s-2)'}}, \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{i_1})}x_{i_1'}, x_{i_{(s-1)'}}, x_{i_s'}))] = -2\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\alpha)}x^u) \in L.$$

Now it suffices to show that $\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\pi)}x^u) \in L$ for $u \in \mathbb{B}^1$. Use induction on $|u|$. For $|u| = 1$ we have proved the conclusion. For $|u| = 3$,

$$[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\pi)}x_k), \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{k'})}x_k x_r x_q)] = -2\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\pi)}x_k x_r x_q) \in L \quad \text{for all } k, r, q \in Y_1.$$

Suppose $|u| > 3$ and write $u = v \dot{+} \omega$, where $v = \langle k, l, r \rangle$. By the argument above, $\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{r'})}x_r x^\omega) \in L$. Consequently,

$$[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\pi)}x_k x_l x_r), \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_{r'})}x_r x^\omega)] = -2\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(\pi)}x^u) \in L.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

In order to determine the nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$, we shall show that if such two derivations coincide on the top of $\mathcal{HO}$ then the difference vanishes. Of course we shall consider the generators of $\mathcal{HO}$. We first consider the subset M .

For convenience, we put $\Delta_i := x_{i'}\partial_{i'} - x_i\partial_i = \mathrm{T}_H(x_i x_{i'})$ for $i \in Y_0$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$, then*

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1, 0 \leq a \leq \pi_i.$$

Proof. For $a = 2$, by Lemma 1.1 one may assume that

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Direct computation shows that $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_i] = \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})$. Applying ϕ yields that

$$\left[\sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r, \Delta_i \right] = \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}} (c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} - c_{ui} x^u \partial_i) - \delta_{i' \in u} \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r,$$

where $\delta_{i' \in u}$ means it is 1 if $i' \in u$ or 0 otherwise. A comparison of coefficients shows that

$$(1 + \delta_{i' \in u})c_{ur} = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}, u \in \mathbb{B}; \quad (2.1)$$

$$(2 + \delta_{i' \in u})c_{ui} = 0 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{B}; \quad (2.2)$$

$$\delta_{i' \in u} c_{ui'} = 0 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{B}. \quad (2.3)$$

Noticing that $\text{char} \mathbb{F} > 3$, by (2.1) and (2.2) one gets $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y \setminus i'$. Thus,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'}.$$

For any fixed $u \in \mathbb{B}^1$, if $i' \in u$, then (2.3) yields $c_{ui'} = 0$; if $i' \notin u$, since $|u| \geq 2$, there is $l \in u$ such that $[T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ , one may obtain that $-\sum_{i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} = 0$. It follows that $c_{ui'} = 0$. Consequently, $\phi(T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = 0$.

In the following we use induction on $a \geq 3$ to show that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = 0$. Assume our assertion holds for $a - 1$. By Lemma 1.1 one may assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Note that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}), \Delta_i] = (a - 1) T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}).$$

Applying ϕ , one gets

$$\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}} (c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} - c_{ui} x^u \partial_i) - \delta_{i' \in u} \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = (a - 1) \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

A comparison of coefficients yields

$$(a - 1 + \delta_{i' \in u}) c_{ur} = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}, u \in \mathbb{B}; \quad (2.4)$$

$$(a + \delta_{i' \in u}) c_{ui} = 0 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{B}; \quad (2.5)$$

$$(a - 2 + \delta_{i' \in u}) c_{ui'} = 0 \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{B}. \quad (2.6)$$

The following discuss is divided into two parts.

Part I: $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. By (2.6), $c_{ui'} = 0$ and therefore,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = \sum_{\substack{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus i'}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r + \sum_{\substack{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus i'}} c_{vr} x^v \partial_r.$$

By (2.4) and (2.5),

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = \sum_{\substack{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r + \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi} x^v \partial_i.$$

For any fixed u with $i' \in u$, since $|u| \geq 3$, there is $l \in u$ such that $l \neq i'$. Compute $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ to this equation, one gets

$$\sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}} (c_{ul} x^u \partial_l - c_{ul'} x^u \partial_{l'}) - \sum_{\substack{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r - \delta_{l \in v} \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi} x^v \partial_i = 0,$$

and hence $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y \setminus l$. Thus

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ul}x^u\partial_l + \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi}x^v\partial_i.$$

Given u satisfying $i', l \in u$, since $|u| \geq 3$, there is $q \in u$ such that $q \neq i', l$. Note that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{q'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ , one computes

$$- \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ul}x^u\partial_l - \delta_{q \in v} \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi}x^v\partial_i = 0.$$

Hence $c_{ul} = 0$. Given v satisfying $i' \notin v$, by the equation above, one gets

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{q, i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi}x^v\partial_i.$$

Since $|v| \geq 3$, there is $r \in v$ such that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{r'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ , we have

$$- \sum_{q, i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{vi}x^v\partial_i = 0.$$

This implies that $c_{vi} = 0$. As a result, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$.

Part II: $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Here we proceed in four steps.

Step (i): $a \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. By (2.5), $c_{ui} = 0$. Then by (2.4) and (2.6),

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'}x^u\partial_{i'} + \sum_{\substack{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r.$$

For any given u satisfying $i' \in u$, since $|u| \geq 3$, there is $l \in u$ such that $l \neq i'$. Direct computation shows that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ yields

$$- \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'}x^u\partial_{i'} + \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}} (c_{vl}x^v\partial_l - c_{vl'}x^v\partial_{l'}) - \delta_{l \in v} \sum_{\substack{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r = 0.$$

It follows that $c_{ui'} = 0$ and therefore,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{\substack{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r.$$

For any given v satisfying $i' \notin v$, since $|v| \geq 3$, there is $q \in v$ such that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{q'}] = 0.$$

Applying ϕ yields

$$\sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}} (c_{vq}x^v\partial_q - c_{vq'}x^v\partial_{q'}) - \sum_{\substack{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B} \\ r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}}} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r = 0.$$

Therefore, $c_{vr} = 0$ for $r \in Y \setminus q$. Thus

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{vq}x^v\partial_q.$$

Since $|v| \geq 3$, there is $r \in v$, $q \neq r$ such that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{r'}] = 0.$$

Applying ϕ , we have $-\sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{vq}x^v\partial_q = 0$. It follows that $c_{vq} = 0$. So

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0.$$

Step (ii): $a \equiv 2 \pmod{p}$. By (2.4) and (2.5), $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y \setminus i'$. It follows that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'}x^u\partial_{i'} + \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{vi'}x^v\partial_{i'}.$$

For any fixed u satisfying $i' \in u$, by (2.6), $c_{ui'} = 0$. Consequently,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{vi'}x^v\partial_{i'}.$$

For any fixed v satisfying $i' \notin v$, since $|v| \geq 3$, there is $l \in v$ such that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0.$$

Applying ϕ we have $-\sum_{i' \notin v \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{vi'}x^v\partial_{i'} = 0$. This implies that $c_{vi'} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$.

Step (iii): $a \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$. By (2.4) and (2.6), $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y \setminus i$. For any fixed v satisfying $i' \notin v$, by (2.5), $c_{vi} = 0$ and consequently,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ui}x^u\partial_i.$$

For any fixed u satisfying $i' \in u$, since $|u| \geq 3$, there is $l \in u$ such that $l \neq i'$. Note that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ we obtain that $-\sum_{i' \in u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ui}x^u\partial_i = 0$. This implies that $c_{ui} = 0$ and hence, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$.

Step (iv): $a \not\equiv -1, 1, 2 \pmod{p}$. By (2.4)–(2.6), we have $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y$ and $u \in \mathbb{B}$. It follows that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$. Note that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), T_H(x_i x_k)] = -T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k) \quad \text{for } k \in Y \setminus i'.$$

Applying ϕ the equation above gives

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0 \quad \text{for } k \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Hence, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$ for $i \in Y_0$, $k \in Y_1$. $\square$

We next consider the subset N of the generating set of $\mathcal{HO}$. First consider the action on N of derivations of odd $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$ odd. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$, then $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$ for all $k, l, q \in Y_1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, one may assume that

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Note that $[\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \Delta_{k'}] = -\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)$. Applying ϕ gives

$$\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{uk} x^u \partial_k - \delta_{k \in u} \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = - \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

For any fixed u , if $k \notin u$, then $c_{ur} = 0$ for all $r \in Y_1$. If $k \in u$, then $c_{uk} = 0$. Therefore,

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{\substack{k \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1 \\ r \in Y_1 \setminus k}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Similarly, it is easily seen that

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{\substack{k, l, q \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1 \\ r \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q\}}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

The equation above implies that our conclusion holds when $n = 3$. Let us consider the case that $n > 3$. For $n = 4$, given any u satisfying $k, l, q \in u$, since $u \in \mathbb{B}^1$ implies that $|u| < 4$, there is $s \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q\}$ such that $s \notin u$. Direct computation shows that $[\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \Delta_{s'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ yields $\sum_{k, l, q \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{us} x^u \partial_s = 0$. Consequently, $c_{us} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$. For $n > 4$, just as above, one may obtain that

$$\sum_{k, l, q \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{us} x^u \partial_s - \delta_{s \in u} \sum_{\substack{k, l, q \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1 \\ r \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q\}}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = 0.$$

If $s \notin u$ then $c_{us} = 0$ for all $s \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q\}$; if $s \in u$ then $c_{ur} = 0$ for all $r \in Y_1 \setminus s$. Consequently,

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{k, l, q, s \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{us} x^u \partial_s.$$

Note that

$$[\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \text{T}_H(x_s x_{r'})] = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q, s\}.$$

Applying ϕ yields $\sum_{k, l, q, s \in u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{us} x^u \partial_r = 0$. This implies that $c_{us} = 0$ and hence

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k, l, q \in Y_1.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Let us consider the derivations of even $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$ even. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_0 \oplus \mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$, then $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$ for all $k, l, q \in Y_1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, we may assume that

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Assume that $n > 3$. Then for arbitrary $s \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, l, q\}$, it is easy to see that $[\mathrm{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \Delta_{s'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ we have

$$-\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{us'} x^u \partial_{s'} - \delta_{s \in u} \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{\substack{s \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^0 \\ r \in Y_0 \setminus s'}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Note that $[\mathrm{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \mathrm{T}_H(x_{k'} x_l)] = 0$. Applying ϕ we have

$$-\sum_{s \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{uk'} x^u \partial_{s'} - \sum_{\substack{s \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^0 \\ r \in Y_0 \setminus s'}} c_{ur} x_l \partial_k(x^u) \partial_r = 0.$$

It follows that $c_{uk'} = 0$. Similarly, one gets $c_{ul'} = 0$ and $c_{uq'} = 0$. It follows that $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$. For $n = 3$, the argument is similar and much easier. $\square$

By Lemmas 2.2–2.4, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$, then $\phi = 0$.*

This proposition tells us that the nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$ are completely determined by the top of $\mathcal{HO}$. In order to reduce the nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$ to vanish on the top, we establish the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $r \leq n$ be a positive integer and $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_r \in \Lambda(n)$. Suppose that*

$$(a) \quad \Delta_i(f_j) = \Delta_j(f_i), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq r;$$

$$(b) \quad \Delta_i(f_i) = f_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

Then there is $f \in \Lambda(n)$ such that $\Delta_i(f) = f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Proof. We verify the conditions of Lemma 1.2. Since $(x_k \partial_k)^2 = x_k \partial_k$ for all $k \in Y_1$, it is easily seen that $\Delta_i^2|_{\Lambda(n)} = \Delta_i|_{\Lambda(n)}$. Let $A_i := \Delta_i|_{\Lambda(n)}$, $B_i := \mathrm{id}_{\Lambda(n)}$. Then $A_i B_i A_i = A_i^2 = A_i$, that is, (i) holds. Lemma 1.2(ii) is obvious. By (a), (iii) holds. By (b), $A_i B_i(f_i) = A_i(f_i) = f_i$. Clearly, $A_i B_j = B_j A_i$, $1 \leq i, j \leq r$, $i \neq j$. Thus (iv) holds. By Lemma 1.2, there is $f \in \Lambda(n)$ such that $\Delta_i(f) = f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. $\square$

According to Proposition 2.5, it suffices to consider the top for the nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$. In the proof of the following lemma we shall adopt the methods used in the proof of [6, Lemma 4.2.5, Proposition 3.2.4].

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\phi \in \mathrm{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$ even. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$, then there is $D \in \mathcal{G}_t$ such that $(\phi - \mathrm{ad}D)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, one may assume that $\phi(\Delta_i) = \sum_{r \in Y_1} f_{ri'} \partial_r$, where $f_{ri'} \in \Lambda(n)$. Note that

$$[\Delta_i, \Delta_j] = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, j \in Y_0 \text{ with } i \neq j.$$

Applying ϕ and comparing coefficients one may obtain that

$$\Delta_i(f_{rj'}) = \Delta_j(f_{ri'}) \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', j'\}; \quad (2.7)$$

$$\Delta_j(f_{i'i'}) = \Delta_i(f_{i'j'}) - f_{i'j'} \quad \text{whenever } i, j \in Y_0 \text{ with } i \neq j. \quad (2.8)$$

For $r, i' \in Y_1$, Suppose $f_{ri'} = \sum_{|u|=t+1} c_{uri'} x^u$, where $c_{uri'} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then by (2.7), $\delta_{i' \in u} c_{urj'} = \delta_{j' \in u} c_{uri'}$ for $r \neq i', j'$. This implies that

$$c_{uri'} \neq 0 \text{ and } j' \in u \iff c_{urj'} \neq 0 \text{ and } i' \in u.$$

Let $r, i' \in Y_1$ with $r \neq i'$. If $c_{uri'} \neq 0$, then the implication ensures that there is $i' \in u$ and therefore,

$$\Delta_i(f_{ri'}) = f_{ri'}, \quad r \neq i'. \quad (2.9)$$

For any fixed $r \in Y_1$, by Lemma 2.6, there is $\bar{f}_r \in \Lambda(n)$ such that

$$\Delta_i(\bar{f}_r) = f_{ri'} \quad \text{for all } i' \in Y_1 \setminus r. \quad (2.10)$$

Assert that $\Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) = 0$ for all $i' \in Y_1$. We first consider the case $t \geq 2$. By (2.8),

$$\Delta_j \Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) = \Delta_i \Delta_j(f_{i'i'}) = \Delta_i^2(f_{i'j'}) - \Delta_i(f_{i'j'}) = 0 \quad \text{for } j' \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Assume that $\Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) \neq 0$. Since $\text{zd}(f_{i'i'}) = t + 1 \geq 3$, there is $r \in u \setminus i'$ such that $\Delta_r \Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) \neq 0$, contradicting the equation above. Hence, $\Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) = 0$.

Let us consider the case $t = 0$. Apply ϕ to the equation that $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'}), \Delta_i] = \text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'})$ for $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$. We have

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'})) + [\Delta_i, \phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'}))] = [\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'}), \phi(\Delta_i)].$$

On the other hand, since $\text{zd}(f_{ri'}) = 1$, by (2.9), for $r \neq i'$, we have $f_{ri'} = c_{ri'} x_{i'}$, where $c_{ri'} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then

$$\phi(\Delta_i) = \sum_{r \in Y_1} f_{ri'} \partial_r = f_{i'i'} \partial_{i'} + \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{ri'} x_{i'} \partial_r.$$

Consequently,

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'})) + [\Delta_i, \phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'}))] = (\partial_{i'}(f_{i'i'}) x_{j'} - c_{j'i'} x_{i'}) \partial_{i'} + \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{ri'} x_{j'} \partial_r. \quad (2.11)$$

Since $\text{zd}(\phi) = 0$, $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'})) = \sum_{s, r \in Y_1} \mu_{s, r}^{(i, j')} x_s \partial_r$ where $\mu_{s, r}^{(i, j')} \in \mathbb{F}$. Note that $[\Delta_i, x_s \partial_r] = (\delta_{i' s} - \delta_{i' r}) x_s \partial_r$. It follows that

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'})) + [\Delta_i, \phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_{j'}))] = \sum_{s, r \in Y_1} \mu_{s, r}^{(i, j')} x_s \partial_r + \sum_{s, r \in Y_1} (\delta_{i' s} - \delta_{i' r}) \mu_{s, r}^{(i, j')} x_s \partial_r.$$

In the equation above the coefficient of $\partial_{i'}$ is

$$\sum_{s \in Y_1} \mu_{s, i'}^{(i, j')} x_s + \sum_{s \in Y_1} (\delta_{i' s} - \delta_{i' i'}) \mu_{s, i'}^{(i, j')} x_s = \sum_{s \in Y_1} \delta_{i' s} \mu_{s, i'}^{(i, j')} x_s = \mu_{i', i'}^{(i, j')} x_{i'}.$$

By (2.11), $\partial_{i'}(f_{i'i'})x_{j'} - c_{j'i'}x_{i'} = \mu_{i',i'}^{(i,j')}x_{i'}$ for $i \neq j$. Hence, $\partial_{i'}(f_{i'i'}) = 0$ and $\Delta_i(f_{i'i'}) = 0$. Thus our assertion holds.

For $r \in Y_1$, let $f_r := -f_{rr} + \Delta_{r'}(\bar{f}_r)$. Clearly, $f_r \in \Lambda(n)$ and

$$\Delta_{r'}(f_r) = \Delta_{r'}(-f_{rr}) + \Delta_{r'}^2(\bar{f}_r) = \Delta_{r'}(\bar{f}_r) = f_r + f_{rr}.$$

Then

$$\Delta_{r'}(f_r) - f_r = f_{rr}. \quad (2.12)$$

For $i' \in Y_1 \setminus r$, by (2.8) and (2.10), one may compute $\Delta_i(f_r) = f_{ri'}$. Putting $D' := -\sum_{r \in Y_1} f_r \partial_r$, then by (2.12), we have

$$[D', \Delta_i] = -\sum_{r \in Y_1} [f_r \partial_r, \Delta_i] = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} f_{ri'} \partial_r + f_{i'i'} \partial_{i'} = \phi(\Delta_i).$$

Put $D := D'_t$. Then $D \in \mathcal{G}_t$ and $[D, \Delta_i] = \phi(\Delta_i)$. It follows that $(\phi - \text{ad}D)(\Delta_i) = 0$. Let $\psi := \phi - \text{ad}D$ and suppose

$$\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{for } k \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Note that $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \Delta_i] = \text{T}_H(x_i x_k)$. Applying ψ we have

$$\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} - \delta_{i' \in u} \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Therefore, $\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = \sum_{i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'}$. Note that

$$[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -\text{T}_H(x_i x_k) \quad \text{for } k \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Applying ψ we have

$$-\delta_{k \in u} \sum_{i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} = -\sum_{i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'}.$$

Hence

$$\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = \sum_{\substack{k \in u \\ i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1}} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'}.$$

If $t > 0$, for any fixed u satisfying $i' \notin u$ and $k \in u$, since $|u| \geq 2$, there is $r \in u \setminus k$ such that $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \Delta_{r'}] = 0$. Then by applying ψ we have $-\sum_{\substack{k \in u \\ i' \notin u \in \mathbb{B}^1}} c_{ui'} x^u \partial_{i'} = 0$ and hence $c_{ui'} = 0$. Thus $\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = 0$. If $t = 0$, then $\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = c_{ki'} x_k \partial_{i'}$. Applying ψ to the equation that

$$[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \text{T}_H(x_{i'} x_{l'})] = \text{T}_H(x_{l'} x_k) \quad \text{for } l \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, i'\},$$

one may get $c_{ki'} + c_{i'l} = c_{kl}$. Similarly, from the equation that

$$[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \text{T}_H(x_{k'} x_{i'})] = \Delta_{k'} - \Delta_i,$$

one gets $c_{ki'} + c_{i'k} = 0$. Clearly, the following system of $n - 1$ equations has solutions:

$$\lambda_{1'} - \lambda_{2'} = c_{1'2'}$$

$$\lambda_{1'} - \lambda_{3'} = c_{1'3'}$$

$$\dots\dots\dots$$

$$\lambda_{1'} - \lambda_{n'} = c_{1'n'}.$$

Let $(\lambda_{1'}, \lambda_{2'}, \dots, \lambda_{n'})$ be a solution. Then

$$\lambda_k - \lambda_l = (\lambda_k - \lambda_{1'}) + (\lambda_{1'} - \lambda_l) = c_{kl}.$$

Let $D'' := \sum_{r \in Y_1} \lambda_r x_r \partial_r$ and $\varphi := \psi - \text{ad} D''$. Then $\varphi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = 0$ for $i \neq k'$. In addition, $\varphi(\Delta_i) = 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t \geq 0$ odd. If $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$, then there is $D \in \mathcal{G}_t$ such that $(\phi - \text{ad} D)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, assume that $\phi(\Delta_i) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} f_{ri} \partial_r$, where $f_{ri} \in \Lambda(n)$. For arbitrary $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$, we have $[\Delta_i, \Delta_j] = 0$. Then

$$-f_{ji} \partial_j - \sum_{r \in Y_0} \Delta_j(f_{ri}) \partial_r + \sum_{r \in Y_0} \Delta_i(f_{rj}) \partial_r + f_{ij} \partial_i = 0.$$

A comparison of coefficients shows that

$$\Delta_j(f_{ri}) = \Delta_i(f_{rj}) \quad \text{for } r \in Y_0 \setminus \{i, j\}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\Delta_j(f_{ii}) = \Delta_i(f_{ij}) + f_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j \in Y_0 \text{ with } i \neq j. \quad (2.14)$$

Suppose $f_{ri} = \sum_{|u|=t+1} c_{uri} x^u$, where $c_{uri} \in \mathbb{F}$. By (2.13), $\delta_{j' \in u} c_{uri} = \delta_{i' \in u} c_{urj}$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus \{i, j\}$. Then we have the following implication:

$$j' \in u \text{ and } c_{uri} \neq 0 \iff i' \in u \text{ and } c_{urj} \neq 0, \quad r \in Y_0 \setminus \{i, j\}.$$

Let $r, i \in Y_0$ with $r \neq i$. If $c_{uri} \neq 0$, then $i' \in u$ and therefore, $\Delta_i(f_{ri}) = f_{ri}$. For any fixed $r \in Y_0$, by Lemma 2.6, there is $f_r \in \Lambda(n)$ such that

$$\Delta_i(f_r) = f_{ri} \quad \text{for all } i \in Y_0 \setminus r. \quad (2.15)$$

For any fixed $r \in Y_0$ and $i \in Y_0 \setminus r$, by (2.14) and (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i(f_{rr} - f_r - \Delta_r(f_r)) &= \Delta_i(f_{rr}) - \Delta_i(f_r) - \Delta_i \Delta_r(f_r) \\ &= \Delta_i(f_{rr}) - f_{ri} - \Delta_i \Delta_r(f_r) \\ &= \Delta_r(f_{ri}) - \Delta_r \Delta_i(f_r) \\ &= \Delta_r \Delta_i(f_r) - \Delta_r \Delta_i(f_r) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f := f_{rr} - f_r - \Delta_r(f_r) = \sum_v c_v x^v$. Assume that $f \neq 0$. Then there is v such that $c_v \neq 0$. Since $|v| \geq 2$, there is $i' \in v \setminus r'$. Then $0 = \Delta_i(f) = c_v x^v$ and therefore, $c_v = 0$, a contradiction. This shows that $f = 0$, that is,

$$f_{rr} = \Delta_r(f_r) + f_r \quad \text{for } r \in Y_0. \quad (2.16)$$

Let $D' := -\sum_{r \in Y_0} f_r \partial_r$. By (2.15) and (2.16),

$$\begin{aligned}
 [D', \Delta_i] &= -\sum_{r \in Y_0} [f_r \partial_r, \Delta_i] \\
 &= \sum_{r \in Y_0} \Delta_i(f_r) \partial_r + f_i \partial_i \\
 &= \sum_{r \in Y_0 \setminus i} \Delta_i(f_r) \partial_r + (\Delta_i(f_i) + f_i) \partial_i \\
 &= \sum_{r \in Y_0 \setminus i} f_{ri} \partial_r + f_{ii} \partial_i \\
 &= \phi(\Delta_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $D := D'_t$. Then $D \in \mathcal{G}_t$ and $[D, \Delta_i] = \phi(\Delta_i)$. Put $\psi := \phi - \text{ad}D$. Then $\psi(\Delta_i) = 0$. Assume that

$$\psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}, k \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

By applying ψ to $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \Delta_i] = \text{T}_H(x_i x_k)$, one computes

$$-\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ui} x^u \partial_i - \delta_{i' \in u} \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

It follows that $c_{ur} = 0$ for all $r \in Y_0$. Therefore, $\psi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_i)) = 0$. Now we have proved that $(\phi - \text{ad}D)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$. $\square$

The following proposition asserts that all the derivations of nonnegative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree are inner.

Proposition 2.9. $\text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = \text{ad}\mathcal{W}_t$ for $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Clearly, $\text{ad}\mathcal{W}_t \subset \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. By Lemma 1.3, there is $E \in \mathcal{W}_t$ such that $(\phi - \text{ad}E)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) = 0$. By Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8, there is $D \in \mathcal{G}_t$ such that $(\phi - \text{ad}E - \text{ad}D)(\mathcal{HO}_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$. By Proposition 2.5, $\phi - \text{ad}E - \text{ad}D = 0$. Hence $\phi = \text{ad}E + \text{ad}D \in \text{ad}\mathcal{W}_t$. $\square$

3. Negative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$

In this section, we first prove that $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree -1 derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$ vanishing on $\mathcal{HO}_0$ are necessarily zero, then determine the $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree -1 derivations. For our purpose, we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ satisfy $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$. Then $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$ for all $k, l, q \in Y_1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, assume that $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{s, r \in Y_1} c_{sr} x_s \partial_r$, where $c_{sr} \in \mathbb{F}$. Note that $[\Delta_{k'}, \text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)] = \text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)$. Applying ϕ one gets

$$\sum_{r \in Y_1} c_{kr} x_k \partial_r - \sum_{s \in Y_1} c_{sk} x_s \partial_k = \sum_{s, r \in Y_1} c_{sr} x_s \partial_r.$$

A comparison of coefficients shows that

$$c_{kk}x_k - \sum_{s \in Y_1} c_{sk}x_s = \sum_{s \in Y_1} c_{sk}x_s,$$

and

$$c_{kr}x_k = \sum_{s \in Y_1} c_{sr}x_s, \quad r \in Y_1 \setminus k.$$

Then we have $c_{sk} = 0$ for $s \in Y_1$ and $c_{sr} = 0$ for $s, r \in Y_1 \setminus k$. Thus,

$$\phi(T_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus k} c_{kr} x_k \partial_r.$$

Applying ϕ to the equation that $[T_H(x_k x_l x_q), T_H(x_{k'} x_l)] = 0$ one may compute

$$c_{kl} x_k \partial_k - \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus k} c_{kr} x_l \partial_r = 0.$$

It follows that $c_{kr} = 0$ for all $r \in Y_1 \setminus k$. Hence $\phi(T_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ and $\phi(\mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$. Then $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$ for all $i \in Y_0$, $k \in Y_1$.*

Proof. Proceed by induction on a . For $a = 2$, by Lemma 1.1, one may assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{q, r \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{qr} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Note that $[\Delta_i, T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_k)] = (\delta_{i'k} - 2)T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_k)$. Applying ϕ and computing we have

$$\sum_{r \in Y_1} c_{i'r} x_{i'} \partial_r - \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q \partial_{i'} = (\delta_{i'k} - 2) \sum_{q, r \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r.$$

It follows that

$$c_{i'i'} x_{i'} - \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q = (\delta_{i'k} - 2) \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q,$$

and

$$c_{i'r} x_{i'} = (\delta_{i'k} - 2) \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Consequently, $c_{i'i'} = 0$ and $(\delta_{i'k} - 1)c_{qi'} = 0$ for $q \in Y_1 \setminus i'$; $c_{qr} = 0$ for $q \in Y_1$, $r \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Then

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \delta_{i'k} \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qi'} x_q \partial_{i'}.$$

For $l \in Y_1 \setminus i'$, $[T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ and one may get $c_{li'} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x^{(2\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$. For $a \geq 3$, by Lemma 1.1, one may assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y, u \in \mathbb{B}} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{for all } i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1.$$

If a is even, then

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur}x^u\partial_r \quad \text{for all } i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1.$$

For any fixed u , since $|u| \geq 3$, there is $j' \in u \setminus \{i', k\}$. Note that $[\Delta_j, \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)] = 0$. Applying ϕ one gets

$$\sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur}x^u\partial_r - \sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{uj'}x^u\partial_{j'} = 0.$$

This implies that $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y_1 \setminus j'$ and therefore,

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{uj'}x^u\partial_{j'}.$$

Since $n \geq 3$, take $l \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, j'\}$. Applying ϕ to $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \mathrm{T}_H(x_{j'}x_{l'})] = 0$, we have $\sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{uj'}x^u\partial_l = 0$. This implies that $c_{uj'} = 0$ and hence $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$.

If a is odd, then $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0, |u| \geq 2} c_{ur}x^u\partial_r$. Given u , if $|u| = 2$ and $\{k, i'\} \not\subset u$; or $|u| = 2$ and $k = i'$; or $|u| > 2$, then there is $j' \in u$ such that $j' \neq k, i'$. Note that $[\Delta_j, \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)] = 0$. Applying ϕ we have

$$\sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur}x^u\partial_r + \sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{uj}x^u\partial_j = 0.$$

This yields $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y_0$. Thus

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r \quad \text{where } v = \{i', k\}.$$

Clearly, it suffices to consider the case $a = 3$. Compute

$$[\Delta_i, \mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k)] = -3\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k).$$

Applying ϕ to the equation above we have

$$\sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r + c_{vi}x^v\partial_i = -3 \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{vr}x^v\partial_r,$$

and consequently, $c_{vr} = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$ and $5c_{vi} = 0$. If $5 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, then $c_{vi} = 0$ and

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0.$$

If $5 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, then

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = c_{vi}x^v\partial_i.$$

Applying to $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \mathrm{T}_H(x_i x_k)] = 0$ yields $c_{vi} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(3\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$. $\square$

As a direct consequence of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. $\mathrm{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = \mathrm{ad}\mathcal{HO}_{-1}$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. By Lemma 1.1, assume that $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{ikr} \partial_r$, where $c_{ikr} \in \mathbb{F}$, $i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1$. Applying ϕ to $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_k), \Delta_i] = \text{T}_H(x_i x_k)$ for $k \in Y_1 \setminus i'$, one may obtain that $-c_{iki} \partial_i + c_{ii'i} \partial_{k'} = \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{ikr} \partial_r$, and therefore,

$$c_{ikr} = 0, \quad r \in Y_0 \setminus k'; \quad c_{ii'i} = c_{ikk'}.$$

Thus, $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) = c_{ikk'} \partial_{k'} = c_{ii'i} \partial_{k'}$ for $k \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Let

$$\psi := \phi + \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{rr'r} \text{ad} \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{rr'r} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Then for $k \in Y_1 \setminus i'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) &= \phi(\text{T}_H(x_i x_k)) + \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{rr'r} [\partial_r, \text{T}_H(x_i x_k)] \\ &= c_{ii'i} \partial_{k'} - c_{ii'i} \partial_{k'} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $[\Delta_i, \Delta_j] = 0$ for $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Applying ϕ , one may obtain that $-c_{ii'j} \partial_j + c_{jj'i} \partial_i = 0$. Hence, $c_{ii'j} = 0$ and $\phi(\Delta_i) = c_{ii'i} \partial_i$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\Delta_i) &= \phi(\Delta_i) + \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{rr'r} [\partial_r, \Delta_i] \\ &= c_{ii'i} \partial_i - c_{ii'i} \partial_i \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

So far we have proved that $\psi(\mathcal{HO}_0) = 0$. By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, $\psi = 0$. Therefore,

$$\phi = - \sum_{r \in Y_0} c_{rr'r} \text{ad} \partial_r \in \text{ad} \mathcal{HO}_{-1},$$

proving that $\text{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = \text{ad} \mathcal{HO}_{-1}$. $\square$

In order to determine the negative $\mathbb{Z}$ -degree derivations from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$, we give the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ with $t > 1$. For $i \in Y_0$ and $k \in Y_1$, if $\phi(\text{T}_H(x^{(\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$, then $\phi = 0$.*

Proof. We first show that $\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$ for all $k, l, q \in Y_1$. It suffices to consider the case $\text{zd}(\phi) = -2$. By Lemma 1.1, assume that

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r \quad \text{where } a_r \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Note that

$$[\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q), \Delta_{k'}] = -\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q).$$

Applying ϕ , one gets $-a_{k'} \partial_{k'} = - \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r$. This shows that $a_r = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus k'$. It follows that

$$\phi(\text{T}_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = a_{k'} \partial_{k'}.$$

Similarly, noting that $[T_H(x_k x_l x_q), T_H(x_k' x_l)] = 0$, one may show that $a_{k'} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x_k x_l x_q)) = 0$.

In the following we proceed by induction on a to show that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$ for all $i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1$. If $a \leq t$, then $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$. Assume that $a > t$. By inductive hypothesis and Lemma 1.1, one may assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y, |u|=a-t} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r \quad \text{where } c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Suppose $a - t \geq 2$. If $a - t$ is odd, then $a - t \geq 3$ and

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1, u \in \mathbb{B}^1} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Just as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 (for a being even there), one may show that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$. If $a - t$ is even, then

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r.$$

Just as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 (for a odd there), one may show that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0$.

Now consider the case $a - t < 2$. Note that in this case, we have $a - t = 1$ and therefore,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{q, r \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r.$$

(1) Let $k \neq i'$. Note that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k), \Delta_i] = a T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)$. Applying ϕ one gets

$$\sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q \partial_{i'} - \sum_{r \in Y_1} c_{i'r} x_{i'} \partial_r = a \sum_{q, r \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r.$$

By comparing coefficients we have

$$\sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q - c_{i'r} x_{i'} = a \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'} x_q,$$

and

$$a \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qr} x_q + c_{i'r} x_{i'} = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} ac_{i'i'} &= 0; \\ (a-1)c_{qi'} &= 0 \quad \text{for } q \in Y_1 \setminus i'; \\ (a+1)c_{i'r} &= 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus i'; \\ ac_{qr} &= 0 \quad \text{for } q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'. \end{aligned}$$

If $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, then $c_{qi'} = c_{i'r} = 0$ for $q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'$ and it follows that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = c_{i'i'} x_{i'} \partial_{i'} + \sum_{q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r.$$

Note that

$$[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k).$$

Applying ϕ we have

$$\sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qk} x_q \partial_k - \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{kr} x_k \partial_r = -c_{i'i'} x_{i'} \partial_{i'} - \sum_{q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qr} x_q \partial_r.$$

Comparing coefficients yields

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i'i'} &= 0; \\ 2 \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qk} x_q - c_{kk} x_k &= 0; \\ \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qr} x_q - c_{kr} x_k &= 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', k\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$c_{i'i'} = 0; \quad c_{qk} = 0 \quad \text{for } q \in Y_1 \setminus i'; \quad c_{qr} = 0 \quad \text{for } q, r \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', k\}.$$

Then

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, i'\}} c_{kr} x_k \partial_r.$$

For $l \in Y_1 \setminus \{k, i'\}$, we have $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{l'}] = 0$. Applying ϕ yields $c_{kl} = 0$. Thus, $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$.

For the case with $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, our discuss is divided into three parts. First suppose $a \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Then

$$c_{qr} = 0 \quad \text{for } q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'; \quad c_{i'r} = 0 \quad \text{for } r \in Y_1.$$

Consequently,

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qi'} x_q \partial_{i'}.$$

Note that $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)$. Applying ϕ one gets

$$-c_{ki'} x_k \partial_{i'} = - \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qi'} x_q \partial_{i'}.$$

Hence $c_{qi'} = 0$ for $q \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', k\}$ and

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = c_{ki'} x_k \partial_{i'}.$$

For $l \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', k\}$, it is easy to verify that $[\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \mathrm{T}_H(x_{i'}x_kx_l)] = 0$. Applying ϕ we have

$$[c_{ki'} x_k \partial_{i'}, -x_k x_l \partial_i + x_{i'} x_l \partial_{k'} - x_{i'} x_k \partial_{l'}] + [\mathrm{T}_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_{i'}x_kx_l))] = 0.$$

Since $\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_{i'}x_kx_l)) \in \mathcal{HO}_{-1}$, one may assume that

$$\phi(\mathrm{T}_H(x_{i'}x_kx_l)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r \quad \text{where } a_r \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Then

$$c_{ki'}x_kx_l\partial_{k'} + \left[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r \right] = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$c_{ki'}x_kx_l\partial_{k'} - a_i x^{((a-2)\varepsilon_i)}x_k\partial_{i'} + a_i x^{((a-1)\varepsilon_i)}\partial_{k'} = 0.$$

It follows that $c_{ki'} = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$. Second, suppose $a \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$. Then $c_{qi'} = 0$ for $q \in Y_1$ and $c_{qr} = 0$ for $q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Thus,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{i'r}x_{i'}\partial_r.$$

Note that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)$. Applying ϕ one may verify that $c_{i'r} = 0$ for $r \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Hence

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0.$$

Third, suppose $a \not\equiv -1, 1 \pmod{p}$. Then it is clear that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$.

(2) Let us consider the case $k = i'$. Direct computation shows that

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_i] = (a-1)T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}).$$

Applying ϕ and computing one may get

$$(a-2) \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qi'}x_q + c_{i'i'}x_{i'} = 0;$$

$$(a-1) \sum_{q \in Y_1} c_{qr}x_q + c_{i'r}x_{i'} = 0, \quad r \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

Comparing coefficients yields that

$$(a-1)c_{i'i'} = 0;$$

$$(a-2)c_{qi'} = 0, \quad q \in Y_1 \setminus i';$$

$$ac_{i'r} = 0, \quad r \in Y_1 \setminus i';$$

$$(a-1)c_{qr} = 0, \quad q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'.$$

If $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, then $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{i'r}x_{i'}\partial_r$. For $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$, it is easily verified that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_j] = 0$. Applying ϕ we have

$$\left[\sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{i'r}x_{i'}\partial_r, \Delta_j \right] = 0.$$

Consequently, $c_{i'j'}x_{i'}\partial_{j'} = 0$ and therefore, $c_{i'j'} = 0$. It follows that $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$. If $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, the following discussion is divided into three parts.

Case (i): $a \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Then

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = c_{i'i'}x_{i'}\partial_{i'} + \sum_{q, r \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qr}x_q\partial_r.$$

For $j' \in Y_1 \setminus i'$, it is easy to see that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), T_H(x_i x_{j'})] = -T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{j'})$. Applying ϕ we obtain that

$$-c_{i'i'}x_{j'}\partial_{i'} + \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qj'}x_q\partial_{i'} = 0.$$

It follows that $c_{i'i'} = c_{j'j'}$ and $c_{qj'} = 0$ for $q \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', j'\}$ and $j' \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Then

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{r \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', j'\}} c_{j'r}x_{j'}\partial_r + c_{i'i'}x_{i'}\partial_{i'} + c_{i'i'}x_{j'}\partial_{j'}.$$

For $l \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', j'\}$, we have

$$[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), T_H(x_i x_l)] = -T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_l).$$

Applying ϕ we obtain that $c_{j'l}x_{j'}\partial_{i'} - c_{i'i'}x_l\partial_{i'} = 0$. This implies that $c_{i'i'} = 0$ and $c_{j'l} = 0$ for all $l \in Y_1 \setminus \{i', j'\}$. Therefore $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$.

Case (ii): $a \equiv 2 \pmod{p}$. Then

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = \sum_{q \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{qi'}x_q\partial_{i'}.$$

Note that $[T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), \Delta_j] = 0$ for $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Similarly, applying ϕ one gets $c_{j'i'} = 0$ for $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$.

Case (iii): $a \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{p}$. Clearly, $\phi(T_H(x^{(a\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'})) = 0$. □

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose $t \in \mathbb{N}$ is not any p -power. Then $\text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. We first consider the case $t \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Direct computation shows

$$[\Delta_i, T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)] = (\delta_{k,i'} - t)T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k).$$

Applying ϕ one gets

$$[\Delta_i, \phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k))] = (\delta_{k,i'} - t)\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)).$$

Since $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) \in \mathcal{HO}_{-1}$, one may assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r \quad \text{where } a_r \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Then

$$\left[\Delta_i, \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r \right] = a_i \partial_i = (\delta_{k,i'} - t) \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r \partial_r.$$

If $k \neq i'$, then $(t+1)a_i = 0$ and $ta_r = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Since $t \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, we have $a_r = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$. If $t \not\equiv -1 \pmod{p}$, then $a_i = 0$ and therefore, $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$. If $t \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$, then $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = a_i \partial_i$. Note that

$$[T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k).$$

Applying ϕ one gets $[a_i \partial_i, x_k \partial_k - x_{k'} \partial_{k'}] = -a_i \partial_i$ and therefore, $a_i = 0$. Hence

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0.$$

If $k = i'$, then $ta_i = 0$ and $(t-1)a_r = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Since $t \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, we have $a_i = 0$. If $t \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, then $a_r = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$ and hence

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = 0.$$

If $t \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, then $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = \sum_{r \in Y_0 \setminus i} a_r \partial_r$. Note that $[T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'}), \Delta_j] = 0$ for $j \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Applying ϕ one gets $-a_j \partial_j = 0$ and $a_j = 0$. Thus $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = 0$.

Let us consider the case $t \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Write $t = \sum_{s=1}^r a_s p^s$ where $0 \leq a_s < p$ and $a_r \neq 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zd}(T_H(x^{((t-p^r+1)\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) &= t - p^r < t - 2, \\ \text{zd}(T_H(x^{(p^r\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) &= p^r - 1 < t - 2, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\phi(T_H(x^{((t-p^r+1)\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \phi(T_H(x^{(p^r\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = 0.$$

Then

$$[T_H(x^{((t-p^r+1)\varepsilon_i)} x_k), T_H(x^{(p^r\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})] = \left[\binom{t}{p^r} - \delta_{k,i'} \binom{t}{p^r - 1} \right] T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k).$$

Note that $\binom{t}{p^r-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and $\binom{t}{p^r} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Applying ϕ we have

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in Y_0, k \in Y_1.$$

By Lemma 3.4, $\phi = 0$. This proves $\text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 3.6. *Let $t = p^r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{(\text{ad } \partial_i)^t | i \in Y_0\}$.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. Then $\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) \in \mathcal{HO}_{-1}$ for $i \in Y_0$ and $k \in Y_1$. Assume that

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_{ikr} \partial_r \quad \text{where } a_{ikr} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Compute

$$[T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k), \Delta_i] = (t - \delta_{k,i'}) T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k).$$

Applying ϕ one gets

$$-a_{iki} \partial_i = (t - \delta_{k,i'}) \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_{ikr} \partial_r = -\delta_{k,i'} \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_{ikr} \partial_r.$$

If $i' = k$, then $a_{ikr} = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$ and hence

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_{i'})) = a_{i i' i} \partial_i.$$

If $i' \neq k$, then $a_{iki} = 0$ and hence

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)} x_k)) = \sum_{r \in Y_0 \setminus i} a_{ikr} \partial_r.$$

Note that $[T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k), \Delta_{k'}] = -T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)$. Applying ϕ , one gets $a_{ikr} = 0$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus k'$ and therefore,

$$\phi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = a_{ikk'}\partial_{k'}.$$

Note that

$$[T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_{i'}), T_H(x_i x_k)] = -T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k).$$

Applying ϕ , we have $[a_{ii'i}\partial_i, x_k\partial_{i'} - x_i\partial_{k'}] = -a_{ikk'}\partial_{k'}$ and it follows that $a_{ii'i} = a_{ikk'}$ for $k \neq i'$. Put $a_i := a_{ii'i} = a_{ikk'}$ and

$$\psi := \phi + \sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r (\text{ad} \partial_r)^t.$$

Then $\psi \in \text{Der}_{-t}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$ and one may easily verify that $\psi(T_H(x^{(t\varepsilon_i)}x_k)) = 0$. By Lemma 3.4, $\psi = 0$ and $\phi = -\sum_{r \in Y_0} a_r (\text{ad} \partial_r)^t \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{(\text{ad} \partial_i)^t | i \in Y_0\}$. $\square$

Assembling the main results in Section 2 and 3, we are able to describe explicitly the derivation space from $\mathcal{HO}$ into $\mathcal{W}$:

Theorem 3.7. $\text{Der}(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W}) = \text{ad}\mathcal{W} + \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{(\text{ad} \partial_i)^{p^{k_i}} | i \in Y_0, 1 \leq k_i < t_i\}$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Propositions 2.9, 3.3, 3.5 and 3.6. $\square$

4. The derivation algebra of $\mathcal{HO}$

In this section, using the results obtained in Sections 2 and 3, we shall determine the derivation algebra and outerderivation algebra of for the even part of the Hamiltonian superalgebra. Note that by [8, Proposition 20, p. 202],

$$\mathcal{HO} = \overline{\mathcal{HO}} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i \partial_i \in \mathcal{W} \mid \partial_i(a_{j'}) = (-1)^{\mu(i)\mu(j)+\mu(i)+\mu(j)} \partial_j(a_{i'}), i, j \in Y \right\}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let t be a positive integer. Then $\text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}) = \text{ad}(\mathcal{HO}_t)$.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO})$. Then $\phi \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. By Proposition 2.9, there is $D \in \mathcal{W}_t$ such that $\phi = \text{ad} D \in \text{Der}_t(\mathcal{HO})$. Clearly, $D \in \text{Nor}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{HO})_t$. Let $D = \sum_{r \in Y} g_r \partial_r$, where $g_r \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})_{t+1}$. Then

$$[\partial_i, D] = \left[\partial_i, \sum_{r \in Y} g_r \partial_r \right] = \sum_{r \in Y} \partial_i(g_r) \partial_r \in \mathcal{HO} \quad \text{for } i \in Y_0. \quad (4.1)$$

Fix $i \in Y_0$ and put $a_k := \partial_i(g_k)$ for $k \in Y$. By the definition of $\mathcal{HO}$, $\partial_i(a_i) = -\partial_{i'}(a_{i'})$, that is, $\partial_i(\partial_i(g_i)) = -\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_{i'}))$. Therefore,

$$\partial_i(\partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_{i'})) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Similarly, we have $\partial_{i'}(a_i) = -\partial_{i'}(a_i)$, that is, $\partial_{i'}(a_i) = 0$. Hence

$$\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_i)) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

For any $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, $\partial_i(a_r) = (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(a_{i'})$, that is, $\partial_i(\partial_i(g_r)) = (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_{i'}))$. It follows that

$$\partial_i(\partial_i(g_r) - (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

For $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, we have $\partial_{i'}(a_r) = -\partial_{r'}(a_i)$, that is, $\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_r)) = -\partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_i))$. It follows that

$$\partial_i(\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i)) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

For $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, we have $\partial_r(a_r) = -\partial_{r'}(a_{r'})$, that is, $\partial_r(\partial_i(g_r)) = -\partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_{r'}))$. It follows that

$$\partial_i(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Note that

$$[\Delta_i, D] = (\Delta_i(g_{i'}) - g_{i'})\partial_{i'} + (\Delta_i(g_i) + g_i)\partial_i + \sum_{r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}} \Delta_i(g_r)\partial_r \in \mathcal{HO}. \quad (4.7)$$

For $k \in Y$, denote by b_k the coefficient of ∂_k . Then by the definition of $\mathcal{HO}$, we have $\partial_{i'}(b_i) = -\partial_{i'}(b_i)$, and therefore,

$$\partial_{i'}(\Delta_i(g_i) + g_i) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\partial_{i'}(g_i) - x_i \partial_{i'} \partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_i) = 0.$$

By (4.3), $\partial_{i'}(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_i) = 0$. Similarly, for $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, we have $\partial_{i'}(b_r) = -\partial_{r'}(b_i)$, that is,

$$\partial_{i'}(\Delta_i(g_r)) = -\partial_{r'}(\Delta_i(g_i) + g_i).$$

Computing from the equation above one gets

$$\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i) = -\Delta_i(\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i)).$$

By (4.5), we have $x_{i'} \partial_{i'}(\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i)) = -(\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i))$. It follows that

$$\partial_{i'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_i) = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

For $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, $\partial_r(b_r) = -\partial_{r'}(b_{r'})$, and then

$$\partial_r(\Delta_i(g_r)) = -\partial_{r'}(\Delta_i(g_{r'})).$$

Computing from the equation above one gets

$$x_{i'} \partial_{i'}(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = x_i \partial_i(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})).$$

By (4.6), $x_{i'} \partial_{i'}(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = 0$. Consequently,

$$\partial_{i'}(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

For $r \in Y \setminus \{i, i'\}$, we have $\partial_i(b_r) = (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(b_{i'})$, that is,

$$\partial_i(\Delta_i(g_r)) = (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(\Delta_i(g_{i'}) - g_{i'}).$$

Similarly, one computes

$$\Delta_i(\partial_i(g_r) - (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = \partial_i(g_r) - (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'}).$$

By (4.4),

$$x_{i'} \partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_r) - (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = \partial_i(g_r) - (-1)^{\mu(r')} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'}). \quad (4.10)$$

Similar to the proof of [8, Lemma 6], one may show that

$$\partial_i(g_{r'}) = \partial_r(g_{i'}) \quad \text{for } i, r \in Y_0 \text{ with } i \neq r. \quad (4.11)$$

We next show that $\partial_{r'}(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_r)$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$. By (4.1), $\partial_{r'}(a_r) = -\partial_{r'}(a_r)$ and then $\partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_r)) = 0$. Hence $\partial_i(\partial_{r'}(g_r)) = 0$. By (4.7), $\partial_{r'}(b_r) = -\partial_{r'}(b_r)$ and then $\partial_{r'}\Delta_i(g_r) = 0$. It follows that $x_{i'}\partial_{i'}\partial_{r'}(g_r) = 0$ and then $\partial_{i'}\partial_{r'}(g_r) = 0$, since we have shown that $\partial_i(\partial_{r'}(g_r)) = 0$. Clearly, $\partial_{r'}(\partial_{r'}(g_r)) = 0$. Since $D \in \text{Nor}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{HO})_t$, there is $f_r \in \mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t})_{\overline{1}}$ such that $[\partial_r, D] = T_H(f_r)$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{j \in Y} \partial_r(g_j) \partial_j = \sum_{j \in Y} (-1)^{\mu(j)} \partial_j(f_r) \partial_{j'}.$$

Therefore, $\partial_r(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(f_r)$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$ and then $\partial_r \partial_{r'}(g_r) = \partial_{r'} \partial_r(g_r) = -\partial_{r'} \partial_{r'}(f_r) = 0$. Thus we have

$$\partial_{r'}(g_r) = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

It follows that $\partial_{r'}(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_r)$. We have to show that for $t > 1$,

$$\partial_i(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_{i'}) \quad \text{for } r \in Y_0 \setminus i. \quad (4.13)$$

Form (4.4) one can see $\partial_i(\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = 0$. Then by (4.12),

$$\partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = \partial_i(\partial_{r'}(g_r)) + \partial_{r'} \partial_{r'}(g_{i'}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \in Y_0 \setminus i.$$

By (4.11) and (4.6), for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, one may compute

$$\partial_r(\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = 0.$$

Note also that, by (4.10), $x_{i'}\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})) = \partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})$. Then one may see that $\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'})$ is of the form $\lambda x_{i'}$ where $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$. If $t > 1$, then $\partial_i(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{i'}) = 0$. In the following we show that $\partial_r(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_{r'})$ for $t > 1$. By (4.6), $\partial_i(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = 0$. By (4.9), $\partial_{i'}(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = 0$. By (4.12),

$$\partial_{r'}(\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})) = \partial_r \partial_{r'}(g_r) + \partial_{r'} \partial_{r'}(g_{r'}) = 0.$$

Since $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, $\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'})$ is of the form λx_r where $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$. If $t > 1$, then

$$\partial_r(g_r) + \partial_{r'}(g_{r'}) = 0.$$

Let us show that $\partial_i(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_{i'})$ and $\partial_r(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_{r'})$ for $t = 1$. Let $D := \sum_{j \in Y} g_j \partial_j$, where $g_j = \sum_{k, l \in Y} c_{jkl} x_k x_l$. Then for arbitrary $i \in Y_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_i, D] &= \left[\partial_i, \sum_{k, l, j \in Y} c_{jkl} x_k x_l \partial_j \right] \\ &= \sum_{l, j \in Y} c_{jil} x_l \partial_j + \sum_{k, j \in Y} c_{jki} x_k \partial_j \\ &= \sum_{l, j \in Y} (c_{jil} + c_{jli}) x_l \partial_j \\ &= \sum_{j \in Y} \left(\sum_{l \in Y} (c_{jil} + c_{jli}) x_l \right) \partial_j \in \mathcal{HO}. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed $i \in Y_0$, put $d_j := \sum_{l \in Y} (c_{jil} + c_{jli})x_l$ for $j \in Y$. Since $\partial_r(d_r) = -\partial_{r'}(d_{r'})$ for $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, one gets

$$c_{rir} + c_{rri} = -(c_{r'ir'} + c_{r'r'i}). \quad (4.14)$$

For $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, we have $\partial_i(d_r) = -\partial_{r'}(d_{i'})$. It follows that

$$2c_{rii} = -(c_{i'ir'} + c_{i'r'i}). \quad (4.15)$$

For arbitrary $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, similarly, we have

$$[\partial_r, D] = \sum_{j \in Y} \left(\sum_{l \in Y} (c_{jrl} + c_{jlr})x_l \right) \partial_j \in \mathcal{HO}.$$

Put $e_j := \sum_{l \in Y} (c_{jrl} + c_{jlr})x_l$ for $j \in Y$. For $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, we have $\partial_r(e_r) = -\partial_{r'}(e_{r'})$. It follows that

$$2c_{rrr} = -(c_{r'r'r'} + c_{r'r'r}). \quad (4.16)$$

For arbitrary $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, we have $\partial_i(e_r) = -\partial_{r'}(e_{i'})$ and it follows that

$$c_{rri} + c_{rir} = -(c_{i'r'r'} + c_{i'r'r}). \quad (4.17)$$

By (4.14) and (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r(g_r) &= \partial_r \left(\sum_{k,l \in Y} c_{rkl} x_k x_l \right) \\ &= \sum_{l \in Y_0} c_{rrl} x_l + \sum_{k \in Y_0} c_{rkr} x_k \\ &= \sum_{l \in Y_0} (c_{rrl} + c_{rlr}) x_l \\ &= - \sum_{l \in Y_0} (c_{r'r'l} + c_{r'l'r'}) x_l \\ &= - \sum_{l \in Y_0} c_{r'r'l} x_l - \sum_{k \in Y_0} c_{r'kr'} x_k \\ &= -\partial_{r'} \left(\sum_{k,l \in Y} c_{r'kl} x_k x_l \right) \\ &= -\partial_{r'}(g_{r'}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (4.15) and (4.17), one may verify that

$$\partial_i(g_r) = -\partial_{r'}(g_{i'}). \quad (4.18)$$

By (4.3), $\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_i)) = 0$ and then $\partial_{i'}(\partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_{i'})) = 0$. By (4.2),

$$\partial_i(\partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_{i'})) = 0.$$

For $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, by (4.8) and (4.11), we have $\partial_r(\partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_{i'})) = 0$. For $r \in Y_0 \setminus i$, by (4.8), (4.13) and (4.18), we have $\partial_{r'}(\partial_i(g_i) + \partial_{i'}(g_{i'})) = 0$. Consequently, $\partial_i(g_i) = -\partial_{i'}(g_{i'})$. By the definition of $\mathcal{HO}$, $D \in \mathcal{HO}_t$ and $\phi \in \text{ad}\mathcal{HO}_t$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Put $\Gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i'} \partial_{i'}$.

Proposition 4.2. $\text{Der}_0(\mathcal{HO}) = \text{ad}(\mathcal{HO} + \mathbb{F}\Gamma)_0$.

Proof. It is easily seen that $\text{ad}(\mathcal{HO} + \mathbb{F}\Gamma)_0 \subset \text{Der}_0(\mathcal{HO})$. Let $\phi \in \text{Der}_0(\mathcal{HO})$. Then $\phi \in \text{Der}_0(\mathcal{HO}, \mathcal{W})$. By Proposition 2.9, there is $D \in \mathcal{W}_0$ such that $\phi = \text{ad}D \in \text{Der}_0(\mathcal{HO})$. Clearly, $D \in \text{Nor}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{HO})_0$. Let $D := \sum_{k,l \in Y} c_{kl}x_k\partial_l$. For $i \in Y_0, j \in Y_1$, direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{T}_H(x_i x_j), D] &= \left[x_j \partial_{i'} - x_i \partial_{j'}, \sum_{k,l \in Y} c_{kl}x_k \partial_l \right] \\ &= \left(c_{i'i'}x_j - \sum_{k \in Y_1} c_{kj}x_k \right) \partial_{i'} + \left(\sum_{k \in Y_0} c_{ki}x_k - c_{j'j'}x_i \right) \partial_{j'} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l \in Y_1 \setminus i'} c_{il}x_j \partial_l - \sum_{r \in Y_0 \setminus j'} c_{j'r}x_i \partial_r. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $[\text{T}_H(x_i x_j), D] \in \overline{\mathcal{HO}} = \mathcal{HO}$. Denote by a_k the coefficient of ∂_k in the equation above. Then $\partial_i(a_{j'}) = -\partial_{j'}(a_{i'})$. It follows that $c_{ii} + c_{i'i'} = c_{jj} + c_{j'j'}$ for all $i \in Y_0$ and $j \in Y_1$. Let $c := c_{ii} + c_{i'i'}$ for $i \in Y_0$. In the same way one may obtain that $\partial_j(a_l) = -\partial_{l'}(a_{j'})$ for $l \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. It follows that $c_{il} = -c_{l'i}$ for $l \in Y_1 \setminus i'$. Since $D \in \mathcal{W}_0$, $c_{ij} = 0$ for $i \in Y_0, j \in Y_1$ and then $D = \sum_{k,l \in Y} c_{kl}x_k \partial_l$, where $\mu(k) = \mu(l)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \sum_{k,l \in Y_1} c_{kl}x_k \partial_l + \sum_{i,j \in Y_0} c_{ij}x_i \partial_j \\ &= \sum_{k \in Y_1} c_{kk}x_k \partial_k + \sum_{i \in Y_0} c_{ii}x_i \partial_i + \sum_{\substack{k,l \in Y_1 \\ k \neq l}} c_{kl}x_k \partial_l + \sum_{\substack{i,j \in Y_0 \\ i \neq j}} c_{ij}x_i \partial_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (c_{ii}x_i \partial_i + c_{i'i'}x_{i'} \partial_{i'}) + \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n (c_{kl}x_k \partial_l + c_{l'k'}x_{l'} \partial_{k'}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (c_{ii}x_i \partial_i - c_{ii}x_{i'} \partial_{i'} + c_{ii}x_{i'} \partial_{i'} + c_{i'i'}x_{i'} \partial_{i'}) + \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n (c_{kl}x_k \partial_l - c_{kl}x_{l'} \partial_{k'}) \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^n c_{ii} \Delta_i + c\Gamma - \sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k \neq l}}^n c_{kl} \text{T}_H(x_k x_{l'}) \in \mathcal{HO} + \mathbb{F}\Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\phi = \text{ad}D \in \text{ad}(\mathcal{HO} + \mathbb{F}\Gamma)_0$. □

Proposition 4.3. $\text{Der}_{-1}(\mathcal{HO}) = \text{ad}\mathcal{HO}_{-1}$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.3. □

Proposition 4.4. If $m > 1$ is not any p -power. Then $\text{Der}_{-m}(\mathcal{HO}) = 0$. If $m = p^r$ for some positive integer r , then $\text{Der}_{-m}(\mathcal{HO}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{(\text{ad}\partial_i)^t | i \in Y_0\}$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.5 and 3.6. □

Recall the notation $\underline{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ stands for a fixed n -tuple of positive integers defining the finite-dimensional odd Hamiltonian superalgebra (see Section 1).

Theorem 4.5. $\text{Der}(\mathcal{HO}) = \text{ad}(\mathcal{HO} + \mathbb{F}\Gamma) \oplus \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{(\text{ad}\partial_i)^{p^{k_i}} | i \in Y_0, 1 \leq k_i < t_i\}$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Propositions 4.1– 4.4. $\square$

Put $\mathcal{J} := \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}}\{\partial_i^{p^{r_i}} | i \in Y_0, 1 \leq r_i < t_i\}$. Then $\mathcal{J}$ is an abelian sub-Lie algebra of $\text{Der}(\mathcal{O}(n, n; \underline{t}))$ of dimension $(\sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i - n)$, and $[\mathcal{J}, \Gamma] = 0$. Furthermore, by Theorem 4.5 we have

Theorem 4.6. *The outer derivation algebra of $\mathcal{HO}$ is an abelian Lie algebra of dimension $\sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i - n + 1$.*

We conclude this section by the following corollary.

Corollary 4.7. $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{Der}(\mathcal{HO})) = 2^{n-1}p^{\sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i} + \sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i - n$.

Proof. By [7, Theorem 2.5], $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}\mathcal{HO} = 2^n p^{\sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i} - 1$. Then $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}\mathcal{HO} = 2^{n-1}p^{\sum_{i \in Y_0} t_i} - 1$. Let $a \in C(\mathcal{HO})$. Since $C_{\mathcal{HO}}(\mathcal{HO}_{-1}) \subset \mathcal{G}$, we have $a \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{HO}$. Let $a = \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r$, where $c_{ur} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then $[\Delta_i, \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r] = 0$. It follows that

$$\delta_{i' \in u} \sum_{r \in Y_0, u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ur} x^u \partial_r + \sum_{u \in \mathbb{B}^0} c_{ui} x^u \partial_i = 0.$$

For any fixed u , if $i' \in u$, then $c_{ur} = 0$ for $r \in Y_0$; if $i' \notin u$, then $c_{ui} = 0$. Hence, $a = 0$, proving $C(\mathcal{HO}) = 0$. Now our conclusion follows from Theorem 4.6. $\square$

References

- [1] M. J. Celousov. Derivations of Lie algebras of Cartan-type. *Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mat.* 98 (1970): 126–134 (in Russian).
- [2] V. G. Kac. Lie superalgebras. *Adv. Math.* 26 (1977): 8–96.
- [3] V. G. Kac. Classification of infinite-dimensional simple linearly compact Lie superalgebras. *Adv. Math.* 139 (1998): 1–55.
- [4] Yu. Kochetkov and D. Leites. Simple Lie algebras in characteristic 2 recovered from superalgebras and on the notion of a simple finite group. *Contemp. Math.*, 131, Part 2, *Amer. Math. Soc.* RI, 1992.
- [5] W.-D. Liu, Y.-C. Su, and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivations for the even part of the Hamiltonian superalgebra in positive characteristic. *arXive: math. R.A.*
- [6] W.-D. Liu and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivations for the even parts of modular Lie superalgebras W and S of Cartan type. *arXive: math. R.A/0507521*.
- [7] W.-D. Liu and Y.-Z. Zhang. Finite-dimensional simple Cartan-type modular Lie superalgebras HO . *Acta Math. Sinica* 48(2) (2005): 310–319.
- [8] W.-D. Liu, Y.-Z. Zhang, and X.-L. Wang. The derivation algebra of the Cartan-type Lie superalgebra HO . *J. Algebra* 273 (2004): 176–205.
- [9] F.-M. Ma and Q.-C. Zhang. Derivation algebras of modular Lie superalgebras K of Cartan-type. *J. Math. (PRC)* 20(4) (2000): 431–435.

- [10] V. M. Petrogradski. Identities in the enveloping algebras for modular Lie superalgebras. *J. Algebra* 145 (1992): 1–21.
- [11] M. Scheunert. *Theory of Lie superalgebras*, in: Lecture Notes in Math. Vol. 716. Springer-verlag, 1979.
- [12] H. Strade. *Simple Lie algebras over fields of positive characteristic, I. Structure theory*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 2004.
- [13] H. Strade and R. Farnsteiner. *Modular Lie Algebras and Their Representations*, in: Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math. Vol. 116, Dekker, Inc., 1988.
- [14] Y. Wang and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivation algebra $\text{Der}(H)$ and central extensions of Lie superalgebras. *Commun. Algebra* 32 (2004): 4117–4131.
- [15] Y.-Z. Zhang. Finite-dimensionnal Lie superalgebras of Catan-type over field of prime characteristic. *Chinese Sci. Bull.* 42 (1997): 720–724.
- [16] Q.-C. Zhang and Y.-Z. Zhang. Derivation algebras of modular Lie superalgebras W and S of Cartan-type. *Acta Math. Sci.* 20(1) (2000): 137–144.